

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 17-28, 31 and 33 are allowed by the Examiner.

At the same time, claims 29, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Li in view of the patent to Wright.

Also, claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Lee over the patents to Schmidl.

The drawings are objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the drawings, copies of the drawings have been submitted. It is believed that the Examiner's objections to the drawings should be considered as no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 17-28, 31 and 33 has been gratefully acknowledged. In connection with this, the allowable claims have been retained as they were.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the objection of the claims over the art, applicants amended claims 29 and 30, to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

Claim 29 defines a transmitter for preparing a synchronization train for at least one receiver within a transmission system. Similarly to the method claim 17, this claim has been amended to clearly define the linkage for the various symbol sequences (at least two) to gain their metrics and to use these metrics for block synchronization. Claim 29 of course is a claim which defines the transmitter; however, it would make no sense in the apparatus disclosed in the patent to Li to use at least two different symbol sequences, because a person skilled in the art would see no advantage for doing this. Only with the knowledge how these at least two different symbol sequences are processed at the receiver side, a person skilled in the art would use at least two different symbol sequences at a transmitter side. For these reasons, the

combination of the patents to Li and Wright can not be considered as obvious. Also, it would not lead to the applicant's invention defined in claim 29 as currently amended.

Claim 30 has been also clarified in the same way, by defining the evaluation of various symbol sequences to gain their metrics and to select the index for minimizing the total metrics within a predetermined interval in view of block synchronization.

The patents to Li and to Wright also do not teach the new features of the present invention as defined now in claim 30 as amended. These features are not disclosed in the references, a combination of the references can not be considered as obvious and these features can not be derived from the combination. Therefore the present invention can not be considered as rejectable under obviousness rejection.

Claims 29 and 30 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Claim 32 depends on claim 30, and claim 34, in addition to its dependency on claim 30 depends on claim 29. Since these claims

share the presumably allowable features of claim 29 and 30 they should be allowed as well.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233